arXiv:0812.2642v3 [math.DG] 8 Apr 2009

Conformal Killing graphs with prescribed mean curvature

M. Dajczer* and J. H. de Lira†

Abstract

We prove the existence and uniqueness of graphs with prescribed mean curvature function in a large class of Riemannian manifolds which comprises spaces endowed with a conformal Killing vector field.

1 Introduction

Our aim in this paper is to continue the research theme elaborated in [2] where the existence of a Killing vector field in a manifold permitted to formulate and solve Dirichlet problems associated to the mean curvature equation. Here, we expand our scope by dealing with conformal Killing vector fields and the corresponding notion of graph. Our main goal is to provide a significant improvement of the results in [1] for graphs of constant mean curvature and trivial initial condition. This is achieved by means of a completely different methodology that allows us to generalize, under an unifying perspective, several previous results.

The pure analytic method used here enable us to discard or weaken several assumptions in [1]. For instance, we allow prescribed mean curvature and nontrivial boundary data. Moreover, we remove the restriction on the conformal Killing field to be closed. We also remove the restriction on the Ricci curvature to be minimal in the direction of the Killing field and weaken other requirements on the Ricci tensor. Furthermore, we ruled out some restrictions on the metric of the ambient space so that, in particular, our result applies successfully to a class of product spaces.

To explain the framework of this paper we first fix some terminology. Let $\bar{M}^{n+1}$ denote a Riemannian manifold endowed with a conformal Killing vector field Y whose orthogonal distribution $\mathcal{D}$ is integrable. Thus, there exists $\rho \in C^\infty(\bar{M})$ such that $\pounds_Y \bar{g} = 2\rho\bar{g}$, where $\bar{g}$ is the metric in $\bar{M}$. It results that the integral leaves of $\mathcal{D}$ are totally umbilical hypersurfaces. If in addition Y is closed, then they are spherical, i.e., have constant mean curvature.

---

*Partially supported by CNPq and Faperj.

†Partially supported by CNPq and Funcap.

We denote by $\Phi : \mathbb{I} \times M^n \to \bar{M}^{n+1}$ the flow generated by Y, where $\mathbb{I} = (-\infty, a)$ is an interval with $a > 0$ and M^n is an arbitrarily fixed integral leaf of $\mathcal{D}$ labeled as $t = 0$. It may happen that $a = +\infty$, i.e., the vector field Y is complete. For instance, this occurs when the trajectories of Y are circles and we pass to the universal cover in an appropriate manner. Since $\Phi_t = \Phi(t, \,\cdot\,)$ is a conformal map for any fixed $t \in \mathbb{I}$, there exists a positive function $\lambda \in C^\infty(\mathbb{I})$ such that $\lambda(0) = 1$ and $\Phi_t^* \bar{g} = \lambda^2(t)\bar{g}$.

Given a bounded domain Ω in M, the *conformal Killing graph* $\Sigma = \Sigma(z)$ of a function z on $\bar{\Omega}$ is the hypersurface

$$\Sigma = \{\bar{u} = \Phi(z(u), u) : u \in \bar{\Omega}\}.$$

Proving the existence of a conformal Killing graph with prescribed mean curvature and boundary requires establishing apriori estimates. This is accomplished by the use of Killing cylinders as barriers. The Killing cylinder K over $\Gamma = \partial\Omega$ is the hypersurface ruled by the flow lines of Y through Γ, that is,

$$K = \{\bar{u} = \Phi(t, u) : u \in \Gamma\}.$$

Let Ω_0 denote the largest open subset of points of Ω that can be joined to Γ by a *unique* minimizing geodesic. At points of Ω_0, we denote

$$\mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}^{rad}(x) = \mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}(\eta, \eta)$$

where $\mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}$ is the ambient Ricci tensor and $\eta \in T_x M$ is a unit vector tangent to the the unique minimizing geodesic from $x \in \Omega_0$ to Γ.

The following result assures the existence of conformal Killing graphs with prescribed mean curvature H and boundary data ϕ. Here, the functions H and ϕ are defined on $\bar{\Omega}$ and Γ, respectively. Moreover, H_K denotes the mean curvature of K when calculated pointing inwards.

Theorem 1. *Let $\Omega \subset M^n$ be a $C^{2,\alpha}$ bounded domain so that $\mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}^{rad} \geq -n \inf_\Gamma H_K^2$. Assume $\lambda_t \geq 0$ and $(\lambda_t/\lambda)_t \geq 0$. Let $H \in C^\alpha(\Omega)$ and $\phi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Gamma)$ be such that $\inf_\Gamma H_K > H \geq 0$ and $\phi \leq 0$. Then, there exists a unique function $z \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ whose conformal Killing graph has mean curvature function H and boundary data ϕ.*

Proposition 6 below implies that Theorem 1 holds under weaker but somewhat more technical assumptions on the ambient Ricci tensor. We also point out that we can prove with minor modifications an existence result for functions H depending also on t by imposing the condition $(\lambda H)_t \geq 0$ instead of $\lambda_t \geq 0$. In the case comprised in Theorem 1 the condition $\lambda_t \geq 0$ says that the mean curvatures of the leaves and of the graph have opposite signs.

It is worth to mention that $\bar{M}$ is conformal to a Riemannian product manifold $\mathbb{I} \times \tilde{M}$ where $\tilde{M}$ is conformal to M. A quite remarkable fact is that the mean curvature equation for a general conformal metric to a product metric like this does not satisfy, in general, the maximum principle. In fact, in the final remark of the paper we see that the class of metrics which we deal in this paper stands as a borderline for the validity of the elliptic techniques in the treatment of the mean curvature equation.

Assume now that Y is closed or just a Killing field. In each case, a short additional argument to the proof of Theorem 1 yields the same conclusion under weaker assumptions. For instance, in the case of a Killing field we prove a generalization of the main result in [2] under a weaker assumption on the Ricci curvature.

Corollary 2. *Assume that Y is a Killing field. Let $\Omega \subset M^n$ be a $C^{2,\alpha}$ bounded domain such that $\mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}^{rad} \geq -n \inf_\Gamma H_K^2$. Let $H \in C^\alpha(\Omega)$ and $\phi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Gamma)$ be such that $\inf_\Gamma H_K \geq H \geq 0$. Then, there exists a unique function $z \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ whose conformal Killing graph has mean curvature function H and boundary data ϕ.*

The case of closed conformal Killing fields encompasses a broad range of examples, namely, product and warped ambient spaces, that have been extensively considered in the recent pertinent literature. In this case, we can state our result in terms of the Ricci tensor of M^n.

Corollary 3. *Assume that Y is a closed conformal Killing field. Let $\Omega \subset M^n$ be a $C^{2,\alpha}$ bounded domain such that $n\,\mathrm{Ric}_M^{rad} \geq -(n-1)^2 \inf_\Gamma H_\Gamma^2$. Assume $\lambda_t \geq 0$ and $(\lambda_t/\lambda)_t \geq 0$. Let $H \in C^\alpha(\Omega)$ and $\phi \in C^{2,\alpha}(\Gamma)$ be such that $\inf_\Gamma H_K > H \geq 0$ and $\phi \leq 0$. Then, there exists a unique function $z \in C^{2,\alpha}(\bar{\Omega})$ whose conformal Killing graph has mean curvature function H and boundary data ϕ.*

We finally point out that concerning constant mean curvature Euclidean radial graphs over spherical domains, the above result extends the theorems for minimal radial graphs due to Rado and Tausch as well as for constant mean curvature by Serrin and Lopez (see [5] and references therein).

2 Preliminaries

Let $(\bar{M}^{n+1}, \bar{g})$ be a Riemannian manifold endowed with a conformal Killing vector field Y whose orthogonal distribution $\mathcal{D}$ is integrable. Let $\bar{\nabla}$ denote the Riemannian connection in $\bar{M}^{n+1}$ and

$$\langle X, Z\rangle = \bar{g}(X, Z).$$

From $\pounds_Y \bar{g} = 2\rho\bar{g}$ we deduce the conformal Killing equation

$$\langle \bar{\nabla}_X Y, Z\rangle + \langle \bar{\nabla}_Z Y, X\rangle = 2\rho\langle X, Z\rangle, \tag{1}$$

where $X, Z \in T\bar{M}$. It is a standard fact (cf. [6]) that the conformal factor $\lambda \in C^\infty(\mathbb{I})$ and $\rho \in C^\infty(\mathbb{I})$ are related by

$$\rho = \lambda_t/\lambda. \tag{2}$$

Denote

$$|Y(t,u)|^2 = 1/\bar{\gamma}(t,u) \quad \text{and} \quad \gamma(u) = \bar{\gamma}(0,u).$$

It follows from (1) and (2) that

$$\bar{\gamma}(t,u) = \gamma(u)/\lambda^2(t). \tag{3}$$

We have from (1) and the integrability of $\mathcal{D}$ that

$$\langle \bar{\nabla}_X Y, Z\rangle = \rho\langle X, Z\rangle \tag{4}$$

for any $X, Z \in \mathcal{D}$. Thus, the leaves $M_t^n = \Phi_t(M)$ are totally umbilical and the mean curvature $k = k(t,u)$ of M_t with respect to the unit normal vector field $Y/|Y|$ is

$$k = -\frac{\rho}{|Y|} = -\frac{\lambda_t\sqrt{\gamma}}{\lambda^2}. \tag{5}$$

We assign coordinates $x^0 = t, x^1, \ldots, x^n$ to points in $\bar{M}$ of the form $\bar{u} = \Phi(t,u)$ where $x^1, \ldots, x^n$ are local coordinates in M. Then, the coordinate vector fields are

$$\partial_0|_{\bar{u}} = Y(\bar{u}) \quad \text{and} \quad \partial_i|_{\bar{u}} = \Phi_{t*}\partial_i|_u \ \text{ for } \ 1 \le i \le n.$$

The components of the ambient line element $\mathrm{d}s^2$ in terms of these coordinates are

$$\bar{\sigma}_{00} = \langle \partial_0, \partial_0\rangle = |Y|^2 = \lambda^2(t)/\gamma(u), \quad \bar{\sigma}_{0i} = \langle \partial_0, \partial_i\rangle = 0, \quad \bar{\sigma}_{ij}|_{\bar{u}} = \lambda^2(t)\sigma_{ij}|_u,$$

where σ_{ij} are the local components of the metric $\mathrm{d}\sigma^2$ in M^n. Setting,

$$\psi^2(u) = 1/\gamma(u)$$

we have that $\bar{M}^{n+1}$ is conformal to the Riemannian *warped* product manifold $M^n \times_\psi \mathbb{I}$ with conformal factor λ, i.e.,

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = \lambda^2(t)(\psi^2(u)\mathrm{d}t^2 + \mathrm{d}\sigma^2). \tag{6}$$

Finally, after the change of variable

$$r = r(t) = \int_0^t \lambda(\tau)d\tau,$$

we have that (6) takes the form of a Riemannian *twisted* product

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = \psi^2(u)\mathrm{d}r^2 + \theta^2(r)\mathrm{d}\sigma^2$$

where $\theta(r) = \lambda(t(r))$.

The above change of variable is essential to avoid the coefficients of the terms of second order in the quasilinear elliptic mean curvature equation for $\Sigma(z)$ to depend on the function z itself.

We conclude this sections with a few examples to illustrate this change of variable. Observe that all Riemannian manifolds in the examples below fit the assumptions in Theorem 1. Moreover, these examples comprise Euclidean and hyperbolic space forms what implies that Theorem 1 assures existence for radial graphs with prescribed mean curvature in these spaces.

Examples 4. Let $\phi \in C^\infty(M)$ be a positive function.
(a) By means of the change of variable $e^t = r$, we have that

$$\bar{M} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times M, \;\; \mathrm{d}\bar{s}^2 = \phi^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}r^2 + r^2\mathrm{d}\sigma^2$$

is isometric to

$$\tilde{M} = \mathbb{R} \times M, \;\; \mathrm{d}\tilde{s}^2 = e^{2t}(\phi^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}t^2 + \mathrm{d}\sigma^2).$$

(b) By means of the change of variable $t = 1 - e^{-r}$, we have that

$$\bar{M} = \mathbb{R} \times M, \;\; \mathrm{d}\bar{s}^2 = \phi^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}r^2 + e^{2r}\mathrm{d}\sigma^2$$

is isometric to

$$\tilde{M} = (-\infty, 1) \times M, \;\; \mathrm{d}\tilde{s}^2 = \frac{1}{(1-t)^2}(\phi^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}t^2 + \mathrm{d}\sigma^2).$$

(c) By means of the change of variable $t = c + \log(b \tanh{(r/2)})$, where $c > 0$ and $b^{-1} = \tanh{(c/2)}$, we have that

$$\bar{M} = \mathbb{R}_+ \times M, \;\; \mathrm{d}\bar{s}^2 = \phi^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}r^2 + (\sinh r)^2\mathrm{d}\sigma^2$$

is isometric to

$$\tilde{M} = (-\infty, c + \log b) \times M, \;\; \mathrm{d}\tilde{s}^2 = (\sinh(2\,\mathrm{argtanh}\, b^{-1}e^{t-c}))^2(\phi^2(u)\,\mathrm{d}t^2 + \mathrm{d}\sigma^2).$$

In the particular case when Y is *closed* conformal Killing field, that is, when

$$\langle \bar{\nabla}_X Y, Z\rangle = \rho\langle X, Z\rangle,$$

we have that γ is constant. Thus, in this case, $\bar{M}^{n+1}$ has a warped product structure and is conformal with conformal factor λ to a Riemannian product manifold $\mathbb{I} \times M^n$. Observe that now the leaves of $\mathcal{D}$ are spherical, that is, totally umbilical with constant mean curvature $k = k(t)$.

3 Killing cylinders

Let $\Omega \subset M^n$ be a bounded domain with regular boundary Γ. The *Killing cylinder* K over Γ determined by the conformal Killing field Y is the hypersurface defined by

$$K = \{\Phi(t, u) : t \in \mathbb{I}, \; u \in \Gamma\}.$$

Let $t^1, \ldots, t^{n-1}$ be local coordinates for Γ. We denote by (τ_{ij}) the components of the metric in Γ with respect to these coordinates. It results that $t, t^1, \ldots, t^{n-1}$ are local coordinates for K. Let η be the inward unit normal vector along Γ as a submanifold of M. Then

$$\bar{\eta} = \frac{1}{\lambda}\Phi_{t_*}\eta$$

is an unit normal vector field to K. Thus,

$$\langle \bar{\eta}, \partial_t \rangle = 0 = \langle \bar{\eta}, \partial_{t^i} \rangle$$

where $\partial_t = \partial/\partial t$ and $\partial_{t^i} = \partial/\partial t^i$. We deduce from (4) that

$$\langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_{t^i}} \partial_t, \bar{\eta} \rangle = \rho \langle \partial_{t^i}, \bar{\eta} \rangle = 0.$$

Hence ∂_t is a principal direction of K with corresponding principal curvature

$$\kappa = \bar{\gamma} \langle \bar{\nabla}_Y Y, \bar{\eta} \rangle. \tag{7}$$

It follows from (1) and (3) that

$$\kappa = -\frac{1}{2} \bar{\gamma} \bar{\eta}(\bar{\gamma}^{-1}) = -\frac{1}{2} \gamma \bar{\eta}(\gamma^{-1}) = \frac{1}{2\gamma} \bar{\eta}(\gamma) = \frac{1}{\lambda} \eta(\log \sqrt{\gamma}). \tag{8}$$

It was shown in [4] that the distance function $d(u) = \operatorname{dist}(u, \Gamma)$ in Ω_0 has the same regularity as Γ. Hence, local coordinates in $\bar{M}$ near K can be defined setting $t^0 = t$ and $t^n = d$. We denote by (t_{ij}) the components of the metric for these coordinates. Thus,

$$t_{ij}(t, u) = \lambda^2(t) \tau_{ij}(u) \text{ for } 1 \leq i, j \leq n - 1.$$

Lemma 5. *The mean curvature H_K of the Killing cylinder K is given by*

$$n H_K(t, u) = \kappa(t, u) + \frac{n-1}{\lambda(t)} H_\Gamma(u). \tag{9}$$

Proof: We have that

$$\begin{aligned} nH_K &= \kappa + t^{ij} \langle \bar{\nabla}_{\partial_{t^i}} \partial_{t^j}, \bar{\eta} \rangle|_{(t,u)} = \kappa + \lambda^{-2} \tau^{ij} \langle \Phi_{t*} \nabla_{\partial_{t^i}} \partial_{t^j}|_u, \lambda^{-1} \Phi_{t*} \eta|_u \rangle \\ &= \kappa + \lambda^{-1} \tau^{ij} \langle \nabla_{\partial_{t^i}} \partial_{t^j}|_u, \eta|_u \rangle, \end{aligned}$$

and the proof follows. ∎

We denote by Γ_ϵ and K_ϵ the level sets $d = \epsilon$ in M and $\bar{M}$, respectively. By H_{K_ϵ} we denote the mean curvature of the Killing cylinder K_ϵ over Γ_ϵ.

Proposition 6. *Assume that the Ricci curvature tensor of $\bar{M}$ satisfies*

$$\inf_{\Omega_0} \left\{ \operatorname{Ric}_{\bar{M}}^{rad} + \left(nk^2 - \sqrt{\gamma}\, k_t \right)|_{t=0} \right\} \geq -n \inf_\Gamma H_K^2. \tag{10}$$

Then, $H_{K_\epsilon}|_{x_0} \geq H_K|_{y_0}$ if $y_0 \in \Gamma$ is the closest point to a given point $x_0 \in \Gamma_\epsilon \subset \Omega_0$.

Proof: The coordinate d-curve in $\Phi(t,u)$ is the image by Φ_t of the coordinate d-curve passing through $u \in M$. Thus,

$$\bar\eta|_{\Phi(t,u)} = \frac{1}{\lambda}\Phi_{t\,*}(u)\partial_d|_u = \frac{1}{\lambda}\partial_d|_{\Phi(t,u)} = \frac{1}{\lambda}\partial_{t^n}|_{\Phi(t,u)}.$$

Extend $\bar\eta$ near K as the velocity vector field of the geodesics in M_t departing orthogonally from $K \cap M_t$. We obtain for $1 \le i,j \le n-1$ that

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^2\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^j}\rangle &= \partial_{t^n}\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\partial_{t^n},\partial_{t^j}\rangle\\ &= \langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^n}}\partial_{t^n},\partial_{t^j}\rangle + \langle\bar R(\partial_{t^n},\partial_{t^i})\partial_{t^n},\partial_{t^j}\rangle + \langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\partial_{t^n},\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^j}}\partial_{t^n}\rangle\\ &= -\lambda^2(\bar\gamma\langle\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}\bar\eta,Y\rangle\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\partial_{t^j},Y\rangle + \langle\bar R(\partial_{t^i},\bar\eta)\bar\eta,\partial_{t^j}\rangle - \langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\bar\eta,\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^j}}\bar\eta\rangle).\end{aligned}$$

Using (4) and (5), we have

$$\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^j}\rangle = -k^2t_{ij} - \langle\bar R(\partial_{t^i},\bar\eta)\bar\eta,\partial_{t^j}\rangle + \langle A_\epsilon^2\partial_{t^i},\partial_{t^j}\rangle \tag{11}$$

where A_ϵ denotes the Weingarten map of K_ϵ relative to $\bar\eta$.

For the remaining case $i=j=0$, we have

$$\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^0}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^0}\rangle = \langle\bar\nabla_Y\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}\bar\eta,Y\rangle + \langle\bar R(\bar\eta,Y)\bar\eta,Y\rangle + \langle\bar\nabla_{[\bar\eta,Y]}\bar\eta,Y\rangle + \langle\bar\nabla_Y\bar\eta,\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}Y\rangle.$$

However,

$$[\bar\eta,Y] = -[Y,\bar\eta] = -[\partial_{t^0},\lambda^{-1}\partial_{t^n}] = \frac{\lambda_t}{\lambda^2}\partial_{t^n} = \rho\bar\eta. \tag{12}$$

Thus,

$$\langle\bar\nabla_{[\bar\eta,Y]}\bar\eta,Y\rangle = \rho\langle\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}\bar\eta,Y\rangle = -\rho^2.$$

Using (12) we have

$$\langle\bar\nabla_Y\bar\eta,\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}Y\rangle = \langle\bar\nabla_Y\bar\eta,\bar\nabla_Y\bar\eta\rangle + \langle\bar\nabla_Y\bar\eta,[\bar\eta,Y]\rangle = \langle A_\epsilon^2Y,Y\rangle$$

and

$$\langle\bar\nabla_Y\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}\bar\eta,Y\rangle = Y\langle\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}\bar\eta,Y\rangle - \bar\gamma\langle\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}\bar\eta,Y\rangle\langle\bar\nabla_YY,Y\rangle = -Y(\rho)+\rho^2.$$

It follows that

$$\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^0}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^0}\rangle = -Y(\rho) - \langle\bar R(Y,\bar\eta)\bar\eta,Y\rangle + \langle A_\epsilon^2Y,Y\rangle. \tag{13}$$

We also have

$$\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^j}\rangle = -\langle\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}A_\epsilon\partial_{t^i},\partial_{t^j}\rangle - \langle A_\epsilon\partial_{t^i},\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}\partial_{t^j}\rangle = -\langle(\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}A_\epsilon)\partial_{t^i},\partial_{t^j}\rangle + 2\langle A_\epsilon^2\partial_{t^i},\partial_{t^j}\rangle$$

for $0 \le i,j \le n-1$. Taking traces with respect to the metric (t_{ij}) in K with $t^{00}=\bar\gamma$ and $t^{0i}=0$, and using (11) and (13) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}A_\epsilon &= t^{ij}\langle(\bar\nabla_{\bar\eta}A_\epsilon)\partial_{t^i},\partial_{t^j}\rangle = -t^{ij}\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^j}\rangle + 2t^{ij}\langle A_\epsilon^2\partial_{t^i},\partial_{t^j}\rangle\\ &= -\bar\gamma\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^0}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^0}\rangle + 2\bar\gamma\langle A_\epsilon^2\partial_{t^0},\partial_{t^0}\rangle - \sum_{i,j=1}^{n-1}t^{ij}(\bar\eta\langle\bar\nabla_{\partial_{t^i}}\bar\eta,\partial_{t^j}\rangle - 2\langle A_\epsilon^2\partial_{t^i},\partial_{t^j}\rangle)\\ &= \bar\gamma Y(\rho) + (n-1)k^2 + \mathrm{Ric}_{\bar M}(\eta,\eta) + \mathrm{tr}A_\epsilon^2.\end{aligned}$$

However,

$$\sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}\,k_t = \frac{Y(k)}{|Y|} = -\frac{1}{|Y|^2}Y(\rho) + kY\Big(\frac{1}{|Y|}\Big) = -\bar{\gamma}Y(\rho) + k^2. \tag{14}$$

We conclude that

$$\mathrm{tr}\bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\eta}}A_\epsilon = \mathrm{tr}A_\epsilon^2 + \mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}(\bar{\eta},\bar{\eta}) + nk^2 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}\,k_t.$$

Since $n\dot{H}_{K_\epsilon} = \bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\eta}}\mathrm{tr}A_\epsilon = \mathrm{tr}\bar{\nabla}_{\bar{\eta}}A_\epsilon$, at $d = \epsilon$, it follows that

$$n\dot{H}_{K_\epsilon} \geq nH_{K_\epsilon}^2 + \mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}(\bar{\eta},\bar{\eta}) + nk^2 - \sqrt{\bar{\gamma}}\,k_t.$$

Therefore, at $t = 0$ and by the assumption on $\mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}^{rad}$ there exist constants $c > 0$ and $d_0 > 0$ such that

$$\dot{H}_{K_d} \geq c(H_{K_d} - \inf_{\Gamma} H_K)$$

for $d \in [0, d_0]$. Hence, H_{K_d} does not decrease with increasing d. ∎

4 Conformal Killing graphs

The *conformal Killing graph* Σ^n of a function $z\colon \bar{\Omega} \subset M^n \to \mathbb{I}$ is the hypersurface in $\bar{M}^{n+1}$ given by

$$\Sigma^n = \{X(u) = \Phi(z(u), u) : \ u \in \bar{\Omega}\}.$$

We show next that the partial differential equation for a prescribed mean curvature function H in $\bar{\Omega}$ is the quasilinear elliptic equation of divergence form

$$\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{\nabla z}{\sqrt{\gamma + |\nabla z|^2}}\right) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma + |\nabla z|^2}}\left(\frac{\langle\nabla\gamma, \nabla z\rangle}{2\gamma} + n\gamma\rho\right) - n\lambda H = 0. \tag{15}$$

Recall that $\rho = \lambda_t/\lambda$. Here, the gradient ∇ and the divergence div are differential operators in the leaf M^n endowed with the metric $d\sigma^2$.

A sufficient condition to have a maximum principle for (15) (see Theorem 10.1 in [3]) is

$$(\lambda_t/\lambda)_t = \rho_t \geq 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda_t H \geq 0. \tag{16}$$

The graph Σ is parametrized in terms of local coordinates by

$$X(u) \in \Sigma \mapsto \big(z(x^1, \ldots, x^n), x^1, \ldots, x^n\big).$$

Thus, the tangent space to Σ at $X(u)$ is spanned by the vectors

$$X_i = z_i\partial_0|_{X(u)} + \partial_i|_{X(u)}, \tag{17}$$

where $z_i = \partial z/\partial x^i$. Hence, the metric induced on Σ is

$$g_{ij}|_{X(u)} = \lambda^2(z(u))\bigg(\sigma_{ij}(u) + \frac{z_i z_j}{\gamma(u)}\bigg).$$

The inverse is

$$g^{ij}|_{X(u)} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2(z(u))}\left(\sigma^{ij}(u) - \frac{z^i z^j}{\gamma(u) + |\nabla z|^2}\right)$$

where $z^i = \sigma^{ik} z_k$ and $|\nabla z|^2 = z^j z_j$ as usual.

Fix the orientation on Σ given by the unit normal vector field

$$N|_{X(u)} = \frac{1}{\lambda^2 W}\big(\gamma(u)\partial_0|_{X(u)} - \Phi_{z(u)\,*}\nabla z(u)\big), \tag{18}$$

where

$$\lambda^2 W^2 = \gamma + |\nabla z|^2.$$

Notice that $\langle N, Y\rangle > 0$. We compute the second fundamental form

$$a_{ij} = \langle \bar\nabla_{X_i} X_j, N\rangle$$

of Σ. From (17) and (18) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^2 W a_{ij} &= \gamma z_{ij}\langle \partial_0, \partial_0\rangle + \gamma z_i z_j \langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_0}\partial_0, \partial_0\rangle + \gamma z_j \langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_0, \partial_0\rangle + \gamma z_i \langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_j}\partial_0, \partial_0\rangle\\ &\quad + \gamma\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j, \partial_0\rangle - z_i z_j \langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_0}\partial_0, \Phi_{z(u)*}\nabla z\rangle - z_j\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_0, \Phi_{z(u)*}\nabla z\rangle\\ &\quad - z_i\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_j}\partial_0, \Phi_{z(u)*}\nabla z\rangle - \langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j, \Phi_{z(u)*}\nabla z\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

The Levi-Civita connections in M and M_t are determined by the same Christoffel symbols since $\bar\sigma_{ij}|_{\bar u} = \lambda^2\sigma_{ij}|_u$ if $u \in M$ and $\bar u = \Phi_t(u) \in M_t$. We have from (2) and (4) that

$$\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j, \partial_0\rangle = -\rho(z(u))\langle \partial_i|_{X(u)}, \partial_j|_{X(u)}\rangle = -\lambda\lambda_t(z(u))\sigma_{ij}(u).$$

The terms involving the flow lines acceleration are

$$\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_0}\partial_0, \partial_0\rangle|_{X(u)} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_t|_{t=z(u)}(\lambda^2/\gamma) = \frac{\lambda\lambda_t(z(u))}{\gamma(u)}$$

and

$$\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_0, \partial_0\rangle|_{X(u)} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_i|_{X(u)}\big(\lambda^2/\gamma\big) = -\frac{\lambda^2(z(u))\gamma_i(u)}{2\gamma^2(u)}.$$

Similarly,

$$\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j|_{X(u)}, \Phi_{z(u)\,*}\nabla z(u)\rangle = \langle \Phi_{z(u)\,*}\bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j|_u, \Phi_{z(u)\,*}\nabla z(u)\rangle = \lambda^2(z(u))\langle \nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j|_u, \nabla z|_u\rangle$$

and

$$\langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_0, \Phi_{z(u)*}\nabla z\rangle = \langle \bar\nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_0|_{X(u)}, z^j\partial_j|_{X(u)}\rangle = z^j\rho\langle \partial_i|_{X(u)}, \partial_j|_{X(u)}\rangle = z_i\lambda\lambda_t(z(u)).$$

Since $z_{i;j} = z_{ij} - \langle \nabla_{\partial_i}\partial_j, \nabla z\rangle$ are the Hessian components, we have

$$W a_{ij} = z_{i;j} - \frac{\lambda_t}{\lambda} z_i z_j - \frac{\lambda_t}{\lambda}\gamma\sigma_{ij} - \frac{\gamma_i}{2\gamma} z_j - \frac{\gamma_j}{2\gamma} z_i - \frac{\gamma_k}{2\gamma^2} z_i z_j z^k.$$

We easily obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda^4W^3a^i_k &= \lambda^4W^3g^{ij}a_{jk}\\ &= \left(\lambda^2W^2\sigma^{ij}-z^iz^j\right)z_{j;k}-\frac{1}{2}z^i\gamma_k-\lambda^2W^2\left(\frac{\gamma^i}{2\gamma}z_k+\gamma\rho\delta^i_k\right).\end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

Taking traces after dividing both sides by λ^3W^3 yields

$$n\lambda H=\frac{1}{\lambda W}\left(\sigma^{ij}-\frac{z^iz^j}{\lambda^2W^2}\right)z_{j;i}-\frac{\gamma_iz^i}{2\lambda^3W^3}-\frac{1}{\lambda W}\left(\frac{\gamma_iz^i}{2\gamma}+n\gamma\rho\right). \tag{20}$$

Equivalently, we have

$$\mathcal{Q}[z]:=\left(\frac{z^i}{\sqrt{\gamma+z^kz_k}}\right)_{;i}-\frac{1}{\sqrt{\gamma+z^kz_k}}\left(\frac{\gamma_iz^i}{2\gamma}+n\gamma\rho\right)-n\lambda H=0 \tag{21}$$

as we wished.

5 The proof of Theorem 1

Finding a conformal Killing graph $\Sigma(z)$ with prescribed mean curvature function H and boundary data ϕ amounts to solve the Dirichlet problem

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{Q}[z]=0\\ z|_\Gamma=\phi.\end{cases} \tag{22}$$

Proof of Theorem 1: We apply the well-known continuity method to the family parametrized by $\tau\in[0,1]$ of Dirichlet problems

$$\begin{cases}\mathcal{Q}_\tau[z]=0,\\ z|_\Gamma=\tau\phi\end{cases} \tag{23}$$

where

$$\mathcal{Q}_\tau[z]=\operatorname{div}\left(\frac{\nabla z}{\sqrt{\gamma+|\nabla z|^2}}\right)-\frac{\langle\nabla\gamma,\nabla z\rangle}{2\gamma\sqrt{\gamma+|\nabla z|^2}}-\tau\left(\frac{n\gamma\rho}{\sqrt{\gamma+|\nabla z|^2}}+n\lambda H\right).$$

Let I be the subset of $[0,1]$ consisting of values of τ for which the Dirichlet problem (23) has a $C^{2,\alpha}$ solution. Then, the proof reduces to show that $I=[0,1]$. First, observe that I is nonempty since $z=0$ is a solution for $\tau=0$. Moreover, we have that I is open in view of (16). The difficult part is to show that I is closed. This follows from the a priori estimates given below in Propositions 8, 9 and 10 and standard theory of quasilinear elliptic partial differential equations [3]. ▮

Remark 7. We point out that our existence results still hold if ϕ is only assumed continuous. We may approximate ϕ uniformly by smooth boundary data and use the interior gradient estimate to obtain strong convergence on compact subsets of Ω. A local barrier argument shows that the limiting solutions achieves the given boundary data.

6 Height estimates

In this section, we obtain an a priori height estimate.

Proposition 8. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 there exists a positive constant* $C = C(\Omega, H)$ *independent of* τ *such that*

$$|z_\tau|_0 \le C + |\phi|_0$$

for any solution z_τ *of the Dirichlet problem (23).*

Proof: In view of (16) we may apply the Comparison Principle (cf. Theorem 10.1 in [3]) to (23). From

$$\mathcal{Q}_\tau[\tau \sup \phi] \le 0 = \mathcal{Q}_\tau[z_\tau] \quad \text{and} \quad z_\tau|_\Gamma \le \tau \sup \phi,$$

we conclude that $z_\tau \le \tau \sup \phi$. Similarly, for a solution z of (22) we obtain from

$$\mathcal{Q}_\tau[z] \ge 0 = \mathcal{Q}_\tau[z_\tau] \quad \text{and} \quad z|_\Gamma \le z_\tau|_\Gamma$$

that $z \le z_\tau$.

Next we construct barriers on Ω_0 which are subsolutions to (22) of the form

$$\varphi(u) = \inf_\Gamma \phi + f(d(u)) \tag{24}$$

where $d(u) = \operatorname{dist}(u, \Gamma)$ and the real function f will be chosen later. Hence,

$$\varphi_i = f' d_i \quad \text{and} \quad \varphi_{i;j} = f'' d_i d_j + f' d_{i;j}. \tag{25}$$

At points in Ω_0, we have

$$|\nabla d| = 1. \tag{26}$$

It follows that

$$d^i d_{i;j} = 0 \tag{27}$$

and

$$2\langle \nabla_{\partial_d} \nabla d, \partial_d \rangle = \partial_d |\nabla d|^2 = 0.$$

Moreover,

$$d^i{}_{;i} = \sigma^{ij} d_{i;j} = \sigma^{ij} \langle \nabla_{\partial_i} \nabla d, \partial_j \rangle = -(n-1) H_{\Gamma_\epsilon}, \tag{28}$$

where H_{Γ_ϵ} denotes the mean curvature of $\Gamma_\epsilon \subset \Omega_0$ with respect to η.

Combining

$$\langle \nabla \gamma, \nabla z \rangle = -\frac{2}{|Y|^4} \langle \bar\nabla_{\nabla z} Y, Y \rangle = 2\gamma^2 \langle \bar\nabla_Y Y, \nabla z \rangle.$$

with (20) yields

$$\mathcal{Q}[\varphi]=\frac{1}{U}\Big(\varphi^{i}{}_{;i}-\frac{\varphi^i\varphi^j\varphi_{i;j}}{U^2}\Big)-\frac{\gamma}{U^3}(\gamma+U^2)\langle\bar\nabla_YY,\nabla\varphi\rangle-\frac{n\gamma\rho}{U}-n\lambda H. \tag{29}$$

where

$$U=\lambda W=\sqrt{\gamma+f'^2}.$$

Using (25) and (28) we obtain

$$\mathcal{Q}[\varphi]=\frac{\gamma}{U^3}(f''-\gamma\langle\bar\nabla_YY,\eta\rangle f')-\frac{f'}{U}((n-1)H_{\Gamma_\epsilon}+\gamma\langle\bar\nabla_YY,\eta\rangle)-\frac{n\gamma\rho}{U}-n\lambda H.$$

We chose in (24) the test function

$$f=\frac{e^{DB}}{D}\big(e^{-Dd}-1\big)$$

where $B>\operatorname{diam}(\Omega)$ and $D>0$ is a constant to be chosen later. Then,

$$f'=-e^{D(B-d)}\quad\text{and}\quad f''=-Df'.$$

Using (14) and that $\rho_t\geq 0$ by assumption, we obtain

$$nk^2-\sqrt{\bar\gamma}k_t=(n-1)k^2+\bar\gamma\rho_t\geq 0.$$

It follows from Proposition 6 that

$$H_{K_\epsilon}\geq H^*>H\geq 0$$

where $H^*=\inf_\Gamma H_K>0$. Since $\lambda(\varphi)\leq 1$, we obtain using Lemma 5 that

$$\mathcal{Q}[\varphi]\geq-\frac{\gamma f'}{U^3}(D+\kappa_\epsilon)-\frac{f'}{U}nH^*-\frac{n\gamma\rho}{U}-nH.$$

We require $D>\sup_{\Omega_0}|\kappa_\epsilon|$ and denote $nD_0=D+\kappa_\epsilon$. Thus $\mathcal{Q}[\varphi]>0$ if

$$HU^3<-H^*f'U^2-\gamma\rho U^2-\gamma D_0f'. \tag{30}$$

Since $f'\to-\infty$ as $D\to+\infty$, we conclude that for D sufficiently large the inequality holds. Hence, we have shown that

$$\mathcal{Q}[\varphi]>0=\mathcal{Q}[z]\quad\text{and}\quad\varphi|_\Gamma\leq z|_\Gamma$$

To prove that $\varphi\leq z$ on $\bar\Omega$ we just follow the reasoning in the proof of Lemma 6 in [2] (see [3], p. 171). We conclude that φ is a continuous subsolution for the Dirichlet problem (22). ▮

7 Boundary gradient estimates

In this section, we establish an a priori gradient estimate along the boundary of the domain.

Proposition 9. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 there exists a positive constant* $C = C(\Omega, H, \phi, |z|_0)$ *independent of* τ *such that*

$$\sup_{\Gamma} |\nabla z_\tau| \leq C$$

for any solution z_τ *of the Dirichlet problem (23).*

Proof: We argue for $\tau = 1$. We use barriers of the form $w + \phi$ along a tubular neighborhood Ω_ϵ of Γ where we extended ϕ to Ω_ϵ by taking $\phi(t^i, d) = \phi(t^i)$. We choose $w = f(d)$ where

$$f(d) = -\tilde{\mu} \ln(1 + \mu d)$$

and $\mu > 0$, $\tilde{\mu} > 0$ are constants. Hence,

$$f' = \frac{-\mu\tilde{\mu}}{1 + \mu d} \quad \text{and} \quad f'' = \frac{1}{\tilde{\mu}} f'^2.$$

We choose $\tilde{\mu} = c/\ln(1 + \mu)$ with $c > 0$ to be chosen later. Hence,

$$f(\epsilon) = \frac{-c\ln(1 + \epsilon\mu)}{\ln(1 + \mu)} \to -c \quad \text{as} \quad \mu \to +\infty \;\; \text{for} \;\; \epsilon > 0,$$

and

$$f'(0) = \frac{-c\mu}{\ln(1 + \mu)} \to -\infty \quad \text{as} \quad \mu \to +\infty. \tag{31}$$

A simple estimate using (29) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Q}[w + \phi] &= a^{ij}(x, \nabla w + \nabla\phi)(w_{i;j} + \phi_{i;j}) + b(x, \nabla w + \nabla\phi) - n\lambda H \\ &\geq \; a^{ij} w_{i;j} + \Lambda |\phi|_{2,\alpha} + b - n\lambda H. \end{aligned}$$

Here $\Lambda = \gamma/U^3$ is the lowest eigenvalue of the matrix

$$a^{ij} = \frac{\delta^{ij}}{U} - \frac{1}{U^3}(w^i + \phi^i)(w^j + \phi^j)$$

and

$$U^2 = \theta + f'^2 \;\; \text{where} \;\; \theta = \gamma + |\nabla\phi|^2$$

from (26). Moreover,

$$b = -\frac{\gamma}{U^3}\big(\gamma + U^2\big)\langle \bar{\nabla}_Y Y, \nabla w + \nabla\phi\rangle - \frac{n\gamma\rho}{U}.$$

It follows from (26) and (27) that

$$w^i w^j w_{i;j} = f'^2 d^i d^j (f'' d_i d_j + f' d_{i;j}) = f'^2 f'',$$

$$w^i \phi^j w_{i;j} = f' f'' \langle \nabla d, \nabla \phi \rangle = 0$$

and

$$\phi^i \phi^j w_{i;j} = f' \phi^i \phi^j d_{i;j}.$$

Since

$$\Delta w = f'' + f' \Delta d = f'' - (n-1) f' H_{\Gamma_d},$$

we obtain

$$a^{ij} w_{i;j} = -(n-1)\frac{f'}{U} H_{\Gamma_d} + \frac{f''}{U^3}(\gamma + |\nabla \phi|^2) - \frac{f'}{U^3}\phi^i \phi^j d_{i;j}.$$

Moreover, from (7) and $\nabla w = f'\eta$ we have

$$b = -\frac{f'}{U}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{U^2} + 1\Big)\kappa - \frac{\gamma}{U}\Big(\frac{\gamma}{U^2} + 1\Big)\langle \bar{\nabla}_Y Y, \nabla \phi \rangle - \frac{n\gamma\rho}{U}.$$

Using Lemma 5, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}[w+\phi]U^3 \geq & -n(f' H_{K_d} + \lambda H U)U^2 + \gamma |\phi|_{2,\alpha} - n\gamma\rho U^2 - \gamma \langle \bar{\nabla}_Y Y, \nabla \phi \rangle U^2 \\ & + f''(\gamma + |\nabla \phi|^2) - f'\gamma\kappa - f'\phi^i\phi^j d_{i;j} - \gamma^2 \langle \bar{\nabla}_Y Y, \nabla \phi \rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since $\phi \leq 0$, we have $\lambda(\phi) \leq 1$ and $\rho(\phi) \leq \rho_0$. At points of Γ, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Q}[w+\phi]U^3 \geq & -n(f' H_K + H\sqrt{\theta + f'^2})(\theta + f'^2) + \frac{1}{c}\ln(1+\mu)(\gamma + |\nabla \phi|^2) f'^2 \\ & -\gamma(n\rho_0 + \langle \bar{\nabla}_Y Y, \nabla \phi \rangle)(\theta + f'^2) - (\gamma\kappa + \phi^i \phi^j d_{i;j}) f' + \gamma |\phi|_{2,\alpha} - \gamma^2 \langle \bar{\nabla}_Y Y, \nabla \phi \rangle\end{aligned}$$

where $f' = f'(0)$ satisfies (31). It is easy to see using $\inf_\Gamma H_K \geq H \geq 0$ that choosing μ large enough and then c large enough assures that $\mathcal{Q}[w+\phi] > 0$ on a small tubular neighborhood Ω_ϵ of Γ and that $w+\phi \leq z$ on both boundary components. Therefore, $w+\phi$ is a locally defined lower barrier for the Dirichlet problem (22).

It is easy to verify that $w + \tau\phi$ is a lower barrier for solutions of (23). Similarly, just using that $H_K \geq 0$ we can see that $-w + \tau\phi$ is a upper barrier for (23). This concludes the proof for any value of τ. ∎

8 Interior gradient estimates

In this section, we establish an a priori global estimate for the gradient.

Proposition 10. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 1 there exists a positive constant $C = C(\Omega, H, \phi, |\nabla z|_\Gamma|_0)$ independent of τ such that*

$$\sup_\Omega |\nabla z_\tau| \le C$$

for any solution z_τ of the Dirichlet problem (23).

Proof: The proof follows a similar guideline as in [2]. Consider on $\Sigma(z)$ the function

$$\chi = v e^{2Kz},$$

where $v = |\nabla z|^2 = z^i z_i$ and $K > 0$ is a constant. We already have the desired bound if χ achieves its maximum on Γ. Thus, we assume that χ attains maximum value at an interior point $\bar u \in \Omega$ where $|\nabla z| > 0$. This assumption enables us to choose a local normal coordinate system $x^1, \ldots, x^n$ such that $\partial_1|_{\bar u} = \nabla z/|\nabla z|$ and $\sigma_{ij}(\bar u) = \delta_{ij}$. Hence, at $\bar u$ we have

$$z_1 = |\nabla z| > 0 \ \text{ and } \ z_j = 0 \ \text{ if } \ j \ge 2.$$

Since $v_j = 2z^l z_{l;j}$, we also obtain at $\bar u$ from

$$\chi_j = 2e^{2Kz}\big(Kvz_j + z^l z_{l;j}\big) = 0$$

that $z^l z_{l;j} = -Kvz_j$. Therefore, at $\bar u$ we obtain

$$z_{1;1} = -Kv, \quad v_1 = -2Kv^{3/2} \quad \text{and} \quad v_j = 0 = z_{1;j} \ \text{ if } \ j \ge 2.$$

Moreover, we may assume after rotating the ∂_j that $(z_{i;j})$, $2 \le i, j \le n$, is diagonal.

We write (20) as

$$\tilde a^{ij} z_{i;j} = \tilde b, \tag{32}$$

where

$$\tilde a^{ij} = (\gamma + v)\sigma^{ij} - z^i z^j$$

and

$$\tilde b = \frac{1}{2}\gamma_i z^i + \big(\gamma + v\big)\left(\frac{\gamma_i}{2\gamma} z^i + n\gamma\rho\right) + n\lambda H(\gamma + v)^{3/2}. \tag{33}$$

Hence, at $\bar u$ we have

$$(\gamma + v) z^i_{;i} = \tilde b - Kv^2. \tag{34}$$

Covariant differentiation of (32) followed by contraction with ∇z at $\bar u$ gives

$$\frac{1}{\gamma + v}(\gamma_1 v^{1/2} - 2Kv^2)(\tilde b - Kv^2) - 2K^2 v^3 + \tilde a^{ij} z^l z_{i;jl} = v^{1/2} \tilde b_{;1}. \tag{35}$$

The third derivatives of z satisfy the Ricci identity

$$z_{i;jl} - z_{i;lj} = R_{ikjl}\, z^k,$$

where by R_{ikjm} we denote the coefficients of the curvature tensor of M. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{i;jl} &= \big(\gamma+v\big)\sigma^{ij}z^l\big(z_{l;ij}+R_{ikjl}z^k\big)-z^i z^j z^l\big(z_{l;ij}+R_{ikjl}z^k\big)\\ &= \tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{l;ij}+(\gamma+v)R_{kl}z^k z^l\\ &= \tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{l;ij}+R_{11}(\gamma+v)v\end{aligned}$$

since $R_{jklm}z^l z^m=0$.

To estimate $\tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{l;ij}$ we use the Hessian matrix of χ. Since

$$\chi_{i;j}=2e^{2Kz}(2K^2 z_i z_j v+2Kz_i z^l z_{l;j}+Kz_{i;j}v+2Kz_j z^l z_{l;i}+z^l{}_{;i}z_{l;j}+z^l z_{l;ij})$$

is nonpositive at $\bar{u}$, it results that $\tilde{a}^{ij}\chi_{i;j}\leq 0$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}0 &\geq 2K^2\tilde{a}^{ij}z_i z_j v+4K\tilde{a}^{ij}z_i z^l z_{l;j}+K\tilde{a}^{ij}z_{i;j}v+\tilde{a}^{ij}z^l_{;i}z_{l;j}+\tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{l;ij}\\ &= (\gamma+v)(Kvz^i{}_{;i}+z^l{}_{;i}z^i{}_{;l})-2K^2\gamma v^2+\tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{l;ij}.\end{aligned}$$

Since $(z_{i;k})$ is diagonal, it follows that

$$z^l{}_{;i}z^i{}_{;l}=(z^l{}_{;l})^2\geq(z^1{}_{;1})^2=K^2v^2. \tag{36}$$

Using (34) and (36) we obtain

$$\tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{l;ij}\leq K^2\gamma v^2-K\tilde{b}v.$$

Thus,

$$\tilde{a}^{ij}z^l z_{i;jl}\leq K^2\gamma v^2-K\tilde{b}v+R(\gamma+v)v \tag{37}$$

where $R=R_{11}$. Replacing (37) into (35) and multiplying both sides by $(\gamma+v)$ gives

$$K\tilde{b}v(\gamma+3v)+K^2\gamma v^2(v-\gamma)-Rv(\gamma+v)^2+\gamma_1 v^{1/2}(Kv^2-\tilde{b})+\tilde{b}_{;1}v^{1/2}(\gamma+v)\leq 0. \tag{38}$$

Since $\tilde{b}=\tilde{b}(x,z,\nabla z)$, we have at $\bar{u}$ that

$$\tilde{b}_{;1}=\tilde{b}_{x^1}+\tilde{b}_z v^{1/2}-K\tilde{b}_{z^1}v.$$

We rewrite (38) as

$$\begin{aligned}K^2\gamma v^2(v-\gamma)-Rv(\gamma+v)^2+\gamma_1 v^{1/2}(Kv^2-\tilde{b})+\big(\gamma+v\big)\left(\tilde{b}_z v+\tilde{b}_{x^1}v^{1/2}\right)&\\ +Kv\left(\tilde{b}(\gamma+3v)-\tilde{b}_{z^1}(\gamma+v)v^{1/2}\right)\leq 0.&\end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

From (33), we obtain

$$\tilde{b}_{x^1}=2n\rho\gamma\gamma_1+\big(\gamma_{1;1}+n\gamma_1\rho\big)v^{1/2}+\frac{3}{2}n\lambda H\gamma_1(\gamma+v)^{1/2}+\big(\gamma_1/2\gamma\big)_{;1}v^{3/2}+n\lambda H_1(\gamma+v)^{3/2}.$$

Moreover,

$$\tilde{b}_z=n\gamma\rho_t(\gamma+v)+n\lambda_t H(\gamma+v)^{3/2}\geq 0$$

since $\rho_t \geq 0$ and $\lambda_t H \geq 0$.

We may assume from now on that $\gamma(\bar{u}) \leq v(\bar{u})$. It follows that there exist constants $A_i = A_i(\gamma, \lambda, \rho, H, \nabla\gamma, \nabla H)$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, such that

$$(\gamma+v)\left(\tilde{b}_z v + \tilde{b}_{x^1} v^{1/2}\right) \geq \left((\gamma_1/2\gamma)_{;1} - 2^{3/2} n\lambda |H_1|\right) v^3 + A_1 v^2 + A_2 v^{3/2} + A_3 v + A_4 v^{1/2}.$$

We also estimate

$$\gamma_1 v^{1/2}(Kv^2 - \tilde{b}) \geq K\gamma_1 v^{5/2} + B_1 v^2 + B_2 v^{3/2} + B_3 v + B_4 v^{1/2},$$

where $B_i = B_i(\gamma, \lambda, \rho, H, \nabla\gamma, \nabla H)$, $1 \leq i \leq 4$, are constants. Finally, we have

$$\tilde{b}(\gamma + 3v) - \tilde{b}_{z^1}(\gamma + v)v^{1/2} = \gamma_1 v^{3/2} + n\gamma\rho(\gamma + v)^2 + n\lambda H\gamma(\gamma + v)^{3/2} \geq \gamma_1 v^{3/2}.$$

With the above estimates, it follows from (39) that

$$\begin{aligned} &\left(K^2\gamma - R + (\gamma_1/2\gamma)_{;1} - 2^{3/2} n\lambda |H_1|\right) v^3 + 2K\gamma_1 v^{5/2} \\ &\quad -\big(K^2\gamma^2 + 2R\gamma - D_1\big)v^2 + D_2 v^{3/2} - \big(R\gamma^2 - D_3\big)v + D_4 v^{1/2} \leq 0 \end{aligned}$$

where $D_i = A_i + B_i$. Choosing K large enough so that the coefficient of v^3 is positive implies that $v(\bar{u})$ is bounded by a constant K_0 which depends only on Ω and H.

Using the fact that $\bar{u}$ is a maximum point for χ, we conclude that

$$v(u) \leq K_0 e^{2K(z(\bar{u}) - z(u))} \leq K_0 e^{4K|z|_0}.$$

Finally, we observe that minor modifications in the calculations above give indeed

$$|\nabla z_\tau| \leq K_0^{1/2} e^{2K|z_0|}$$

for any $\tau \in [0, 1]$, and this concludes the proof. ▮

9 Proof of corollaries

In this section we prove Corollaries 2 and 3 in the Introduction.

Proof of Corollary 2: We first observe that the proofs of Propositions 9 and 10 still work under the weaker assumption $\inf_\Gamma H_K \geq H \geq 0$. Thus, it suffices to show that Proposition 8 still works if $H^* \geq H$ when Y is a Killing field. In this situation, it is easy to see that (30) is equivalent to

$$(H^*)^2(\gamma + f'^2)^2 f'^2 - H^2(\gamma + f'^2)^3 + 2H^*\gamma D_0 f'^2(\gamma + f'^2) + \gamma^2 D_0^2 f'^2 > 0.$$

Clearly, the last inequality holds for D sufficiently large and the proof follows. ▮

Proof of Corollary 3: Being Y closed we may assume $\gamma = 1$. Thus (8) and (9) yield

$$n^2 H_K^2 = (n-1)^2 H_\Gamma^2.$$

On the other hand, the relation between the Ricci tensors of $\bar{M}^{n+1}$ and M^n is

$$\mathrm{Ric}_{\bar{M}}(X,Z) = \mathrm{Ric}_M(X,Z) - (nk^2 - k_t)\langle X, Z\rangle$$

for any $X, Z \in TM$. Thus (10) is equivalent to

$$\inf_{\Omega_0} \mathrm{Ric}_M^{rad} \geq -\frac{(n-1)^2}{n} \inf_{\Gamma} H_\Gamma^2,$$

and the proof follows. ∎

Remark 11. We have from (6) that the ambient space $\bar{M}^{n+1}$ is a product manifold endowed with the metric

$$\mathrm{d}s^2 = \lambda^2(t)\psi^2(u)(\mathrm{d}t^2 + \psi^{-2}\mathrm{d}\sigma^2).$$

It is thus natural to consider the general situation of an ambient space $\mathbb{R} \times M^n$ endowed with the conformal metric

$$\tilde{g} = \lambda^2(t,u)g = e^{2\varphi(t,u)}g$$

where g is the product metric in $\mathbb{R} \times M^n$. In this case, the mean curvature equation for the graph $X = (z(u), u)$ is

$$\mathrm{div}\left(\frac{\nabla z}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla z|^2}}\right) - \frac{n}{\sqrt{1+|\nabla z|^2}}\left(\langle\bar{\nabla} z, \bar{\nabla}\varphi\rangle - \varphi_t\right) - n\lambda H = 0,$$

where $z(t,u) = z(u)$ and we compute $\langle\bar{\nabla} z, \bar{\nabla}\varphi\rangle$ in the ambient space. We easily conclude that in order to have a maximum principle for the above equation we have to ask φ_t to be independent of t, that is, the function λ has to separate variables. But this is precisely the case we studied in this paper.

References

[1] M. Dajczer and L. J. Alías, *Normal geodesic graphs of constant mean curvature.* J. Diff. Geometry **75** (2007), 387–401.

[2] M. Dajczer, P. Hinojosa and J. H. de Lira, *Killing graphs with prescribed mean curvature.* Calc. Var. Partial Diff. Equations **33** (2008), 231–248.

[3] D. Gilbarg and N. Trudinger, "Elliptic partial differential equations of second order". Springer-Verlag, New York 2001.

[4] Y. Li and L. Nirenberg, *Regularity of the distance function to the boundary.* Rendiconti Accademia Nazionale delle Scienze detta dei XL, Memorie di Matematica e Applicazioni **123** (2005), 257–264.

[5] R. Lopez, *A note on radial graphs with constant mean curvature*. Manuscripta Math. **110** (2003), 45–54.

[6] W. Poor, “Differential geometric structures”. Dover, New York 2007.

Marcos Dajczer
IMPA
Estrada Dona Castorina, 110
22460-320 – Rio de Janeiro – Brazil
marcos@impa.br

Jorge Herbert S. de Lira
UFC - Departamento de Matematica
Bloco 914 – Campus do Pici
60455-760 – Fortaleza – Ceara – Brazil
jorge.lira@pq.cnpq.br